27 Congressmen Introduce Peace Agency Bill, P. 2

Is There A Missile Gap? How Much Is Enough? Startling Figures on State of Our Armaments, Pps. 2-3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IX, NO. 5 FEBRUARY 6, 1961 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

As If the Prophet Jeremiah Were Caught Cheering

At the risk of alarming steady customers, inured to a weekly diet of apocalyptic pessimism, I must confess that I am becoming optimistic. This may seem in its way perverse. Just when a new President sends Congress a first message filled with perilous tidings at home and abroad, your Washington reporter suddenly begins to see hope ahead. I even feel a little embarrassed, like the prophet Jeremiah caught giving three lusty cheers. But ever since John F. Kennedy's first press conference, I haven't felt the same.

The swift movement of events here is bewildering; one would have to print morning, evening, noon and night to keep up with it. The appointments, the policy positions, have something in them for everybody. Mr. Kennedy's heroes are Churchill and the two Roosevelts, but his dazzling sleight-of-hand most resembles de Gaulle's—and de Gaulle, remember, for all the misgivings of the French left is pulling off the miracle of getting France and the French Army slowly to accept the idea of an independent Algeria. I believe Mr. Kennedy, by a similar dexterity, may succeed in bringing about a settlement, first with the Soviet Union and then with Peking, in ways and on terms some of us may find surprising and even unpalatable, but the result can pull us away from the brink.

Bonn-Washington Axis Ending

Some readers may remember that back in the spring of 1953, we shocked some of them with a piece called, *"Challenge to the Left: Back Ike for Peace"*, which proposed that we circumvent the pall of McCarthyism and make Mr. Eisenhower's moves toward a Korean truce the rallying point for public support of a broader settlement; we asked the Left to get rid of its stereotypes and see that the new Republican soldier President was a potential force for peace. So he would have been but for Chancellor Adenauer's skillful torpedoing of one constructive possibility after another on the way to the abortive summit last year, and the tragic accident of the U-2. The latter was due to Mr. Eisenhower's lazy slovenliness about his job; the former, to the pro-Bonn orientation which John Foster Dulles so long gave U.S. policy. The days of the Bonn-Washington axis are I believe over; Adenauer's sudden moves toward a settlement with Poland reflect his fear of being left high-and-dry by bilateral talks between Washington and Moscow; "not a word on Berlin" *Die Welt* of Hamburg complains of Mr. Kennedy's State of the Union message.

As for a new incident or provocation similar to the U-2, its possibility is not to be excluded. There are mountainous bureaucratic and corporate forces against a settlement, with huge funds and resources at their disposal. But they will no longer find a slack hand and an absent mind at the White House. I cannot tell you with what pleasure I watched the new President at his first press conference; his performance washed away a long-held and indeed cherished anti-Kennedy bias. Necessity may make his course tortuous but the direction is clearly toward peace. I feel that for the first time since Roosevelt we have a first-rater in the Presidency, a young man of energy, zest and ability. It is a post in which any man of any quality must grow, but when a man starts out with the gifts Mr. Kennedy so clearly has, we have the right to hope he will grow to greatness, and perform valiantly in the cause of mankind.

Many difficulties and disappointments lie ahead. The narrow victory in the House Rules fight will invigorate the coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats, who see that Mr. Kennedy will have to pay dearly in concessions to get the precarious margins required for his domestic program, but it will also invigorate Mr. Kennedy, and I predict that his personal appeal over TV will give him a better margin in the next House elections two years hence. It is obvious that he loves nothing better than a hard fight; indeed he seems to have a weakness for seeing an Armageddon

(Continued on page Four)

JFK Reading Up on Red China?

The direction of the new President's thinking may be indicated by two books reporters saw on his desk when they toured the newly repainted executive office. Lying on one side of the desk, when reporters looked in, was "Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung" and on the other, Robert J. Donovan's "Eisenhower: The Inside Story."

The Donovan book tells how in the early months of 1953, while negotiating the Korean truce, Mr. Eisenhower "felt that it was unfortunate that a climate had developed in which, so it seemed to him, it was looked upon almost as un-American even to debate the merits" of recognizing Red China. Donovan, who had private information as an authorized biographer, reported, "The President was not convinced that the vital interests of the United States were best served by prolonged nonrecognition of Red China," and "He had serious doubts as to whether Russia and China were natural allies."

Another Donovan disclosure is of immediate relevance for the new President, confronted with the possibility that the UN may soon vote to admit Red China. A similar vote was feared in 1953 as part of a Korean truce settlement. On May 27, 1953, the Senate Appropriations Committee 20-to-3 approved a Republican rider cutting off all U.S. contributions to the UN if Red China was admitted. Mr. Eisenhower talked Bridges and Dirksen out of it, arguing that in a world organization "every nation must expect to be outvoted at one time or another."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kennedy and Eisenhower Differ on the State of Our Missile Defenses But . . .

The most striking contrast between Mr. Kennedy's first state of the Union message and Mr. Eisenhower's last was in respect to the state of our military preparedness. The latter said we had ample deterrent forces; the former, that "we must strengthen our military tools."

Mr. Eisenhower left office with a series of warnings against the forces making for a stepped up arms race. In his State of the Union message Jan. 12 he declared that "the 'bomber gap' of several years ago was always a fiction, and the 'missile gap' shows every sign of being the same." In his farewell TV appearance Jan. 17 he warned against the growing influence in American life of "an immense military establishment and a large arms industry." At his final press conference next day he declared that armament advertising was becoming "a great influence, almost an insidious penetration of our minds."

For Protection or Bargaining?

Mr. Kennedy by contrast implied that our defenses were inadequate. "We are moving," he said, "into a period of uncertain risk in which both the military and diplomatic possibilities require a Free World force so powerful as to make any aggression clearly futile." The reference to "diplomatic" possibilities is puzzling. Do we want more arms against aggression or to be in a better bargaining position?

Significantly, Mr. Kennedy did not speak of a missile gap, though he said he was giving orders to "accelerate our entire missile program." He also ordered an increase in air-lift capacity and a step up in the Polaris submarine program. Just how much these increases will amount to in dollar terms was not made clear; one estimate (*New York Herald-Tribune*, Jan. 31) is that "in due course" they will add about $1.5 billions to our arms budget. These increases come on top of those already ordered by Mr. Eisenhower: a $1,410 million dollar increase in arms spending plus an unspecified increase in expenditures for production of nuclear weapons.

The real test will come on the reappraisal which Mr. Kennedy has ordered the Secretary of Defense to prepare by the end of this month on the state of our defenses. On this he proposes to make his recommendations. The new President will be under heavy pressure from within the Democratic party and the labor movement for a steep boost in arms spending. A sample is the speech by AFL-CIO Sec-Treasurer Wm. F. Schnitzler which was reported in the *AFL-CIO News* Jan. 28. "The peace and freedom of the world," he told a beverage industry meeting, "is imperiled by the forces of aggressive and godless dictatorship. The dictatorships have managed to get ahead of us in rockets, missiles and other weapons of mass destruction."

Mr. Schnitzler must have information not available to the Pentagon. The Pentagon reporter of the *Washington Star* reported Jan. 15, "New national intelligence estimates of

Nuclear War Problems Dept.

We pass on to thinkers at the Rand Corporation two items which illustrate difficulties still to be solved in carrying on themonuclear war. The first was called to our attention by an article in the London Times Jan. 25. Its Military Correspondent was writing of Britain's Rhine Army, which is part of the NATO Command in Germany. He was disturbed by its concentration on nuclear weapons. He did find, however, that the Army was getting rather more exercise in conventional arms than one would have thought because of an unexpected technological difficulty. "It so happened," he wrote, "that a good deal of training in conventional war was carried out, rather by accident, for the simple reason that if nuclear weapons are used at all freely the exercise comes to an abrupt conclusion several days too early, having run out of combatants."

The other problem was brought to our attention by the special Atomic Energy Commission study on the reactor explosion in Idaho. This showed that though skilled teams and special equipment were available it took six days to get the bodies of the three victims out of the reactor. The bodies were so "hot" with radioactivity they had to be handled with the utmost precautions.

Query: If it took trained and equipped crews six days to recover three bodies in a peacetime accident, how many days would it require safely to dispose of 10,000,000 radioactive bodies in one of those relatively small thermonuclear attacks from which Mr. Herman Kahn says we could easily recover?

26 Members of the House Join Kastenmeier in Sponsoring Peace Agency Bill

"Mr. Speaker:

"In the last few days 26 members of this House, from both parties, have joined me in introducing a newly written bill to create a National Peace Agency.

"That bill would mobilize the creative power of American ideas to solve the great problems of disarmament and of reducing international tensions. It would involve physical and social scientists, teachers, public officials, and private citizens in an attempt to bring imagination and thought to bear on the problems of achieving peace. These problems are many and complex. For instance, can we work out a way to detect tests of chemical and bacteriological weapons? We do not know. What kinds of rearrangement of our National economy could we undertake, if the armaments burden upon our budget were to be reduced? We do not know. Are there any new ideas for reducing the tensions that plague our international life? We do not know.

"We could try to answer these questions if an independent agency to explore new approaches to peace were to be created. Such an agency could also train the experts whom we will need to man the inspection posts in any international disarmament agreement. Such an agency is necessary to discover the hard facts upon which our State Department can build sensible policy in negotiating with other nations.

"For these reasons, 26 Members have joined in introducing Peace Agency bills identical to HR 3186. Those members are the gentlemen from Wisconsin (Kastenmeier and Johnson), California (Clem Miller and Roosevelt), Maryland (Friedel), Connecticut (Kowalski), Minnesota (Blatnik and Karth), New York (Pike, Ryan, Cellar, Multer and Halpern), Alaska (Rivers), Missouri (Moulder), Pennsylvania (Rhodes, Nix and Toll), Ohio (Ashley), Massachusetts (Donohue and Lane), Illinois (O'Hara and Shipley), Montana (Olsen), New Jersey (Rodino) and West Virginia (Staggers and Zelenko).

"We hope to discuss before the House, during the next few weeks, the provisions of our bill."

—Robert W. Kastenmeier (D. Wis.).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . Some Stupefying New Figures Show We Can Dump 30,000 MT on Russia

Soviet missile production indicates the 'missile gap' may have disappeared." Two years ago at the height of the missile gap scare, it was estimated that by now the Soviet Union would have 50 to 100 missiles operational "but intelligence officers," said the *Star*, "cannot find nearly that number."

A Sober British Estimate

Britain's Institute of Strategic Studies credits Russia with about 35 operational ICBM's and about 200 long range bombers, a total of 235 instruments for long range delivery of nuclear weapons on the U.S. Against this, according to figures presented by the Republicans on the floor of the House Jan. 25, "the U.S. has well over 2,000 nuclear carrying vehicles capable of reaching Russia." The figures presented by the Republicans without challenge from the Democrats (see pages 1171-81 of that day's *Record*) show the U.S. has:

Two Polaris submarines with 32 missiles capable of reaching Russia; about 16 Atlas ICBM's; "over 600 long range B-52 jet bombers, each carrying more destructive, explosive power than used by all the combatants in World War II"; nearly 1,400 B-47 medium range jet bombers at home and abroad with a 4500 mile range "and distances beyond with air to air refueling"; the first of SAC's B-58 Hustlers, supersonic medium range jet bombers; "fourteen aircraft carriers able to launch more aircraft than the entire Soviet heavy bomber force"; "eighteen wings of tactical aircraft, each wing with a substantial nuclear attack capability deployed globally"; 60 Thor IRBM's in England, capable of reaching Russia; and 30 Jupiter IRBM's being deployed in Italy, "from which Russia can be hit."

These figures cover delivery vehicles in being. Planned and under construction even before any step-up by the Kennedy administration are: Minutemen missiles, 600 to be in operation by the end of 1964; Atlas missiles, 129 to be ready by the end of 1962; Titan missiles, 126 to be ready by the end of 1962; 15 Jupiter IRBM's to be erected in Turkey; and four more Polarises with a total of 64 missiles to be in operation before the end of this year. (Each of these submarines equipped costs about a quarter billion dollars apiece and the Navy wants a total of 45 with 720 missiles, no less.) All these missiles can reach Russia. The figures are stupefying.

One expert estimate, on the basis of the figures given the House, is that theoretically we are now in a position to dump more than 30,000 megatons of nuclear arms on the Soviet Union. It has about 3,000,000 square miles of inhabited area. It takes about 1 megaton to render 1,000 square miles uninhabited and uninhabitable. At that rate it would take 3,000 megatons evenly spread literally to wipe out the Soviet Union. We can deliver more than ten times that much.

Another way of looking at these nightmarish totals—estimates in the nuclear war hearings before the Holifield committee were that 500 megatons would kill 40 million people in the U.S.S.R. At that rate, it would take 2,000 megatons to do the whole population in. We have delivery capacity now for 15 times that much—and many times more in 1962 and 1964. When is enough enough? We hope a few skeptical civilians, not linked with the missile and uranium business, can get in on Mr. Kennedy's reappraisal.

Why Africans Cheer That "Pirate"

"Henrique Malta Galvao, who led the group of men capturing the Santa Maria and who was formerly a Salazar supporter, served as a deputy for Angola in the Legislative Assembly in Lisbon. In 1947, as high inspector in Angola, Captain Galvao submitted a confidential report on forced labor in the colonies which the Government refused to publish. After describing how Portuguese policy in ten years alone—1937 to 1946—had forced over one million Africans to flee the colonies to neighboring African areas, Galvao concluded that their situation was 'worse than simple slavery.' Two years later the report was published by the underground and in 1951 Galvao was jailed."

—George M. Houser, American Committee on Africa, which has appealed to the President not to interfere with the capture of the Santa Maria except to safeguard the U.S. passengers, on the ground that Galvao's action "has widespread African support."

Some Bombshells Real and Metaphorical Around the House Un-American Committee

In a rather overwrought press release accompanying its annual report recently, the House Un-American Activities Committee predicted that the U.S. "faces a period of Communist-fomented violence." The violence so far seems to be coming from the other direction. In Berkeley a religious fanatic invaded the University of California campus office of Prof. Thomas F. Parkinson, a critic of the House Committee, with a shotgun, badly wounding him and killing a student, Stephen Mann Thomas. "God made me do it," the killer told police. "I hate Communists."

In Los Angeles there have been two unsolved bombings. In September a bomb was thrown at the office of the National Committee to Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee, and in December the home of its director, Frank Wilkinson, was bombed. Two of his children were home at the time, but fortunately neither was hurt. Two nights after the bombing, a swastika was painted on the house and his frightened landlord asked him to move. Wilkinson himself was threatened with death after appearing on a TV debate, and a hostile campaign in sections of the press and by Fulton Lewis on the radio have made it difficult to find another landlord willing to rent him a home.

Another kind of bombshell landed on the House Committee here when Marquis Childs made some startling revelations about the film "Operation Abolition," in his column in the Washington Post Jan. 27. Mr. Childs reported the Defense Department had bought 30 prints of this film to show new recruits and had tried unsuccessfully to get the State Department to buy prints, too. Then Mr. Childs disclosed that Defense bought and showed the film despite an unfavorable report on it.

"A report on the film prepared by the general counsel's office in the Defense Department," Mr. Childs revealed, "said that the House Committee seemed to have encouraged the riots with the apparent end of showing how grave the opposition to the Committee hearings was."

Publication of the Childs column was followed (1) by the appearance in the Pentagon that same afternoon of a House Committee investigator trying to find out who wrote the unfavorable report and (2) a telegram to Secretary of Defense McNamara from Joseph L. Rauh for the ADA saying, "In order to make it crystal clear that the new Administration intends to protect the civil liberties of all Americans, it is hoped you will immediately revoke the order for copies of the film 'Operation Abolition' . . . which even [House] Committee personnel have admitted is distorted."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Nuclear Test Ban Treaty The First Essential — Cuba the Danger Point

(Continued from page One)

everywhere. In this respect, the State of the Union message would have benefitted by a little understatement. This is neither Britain in September 1939 nor America in 1933, nor has Fort Sumter just been fired upon.

The Similarities Between K and K

In one sense, of course, the crisis is greater and global, but the hangover of fervent cold war cliches still impede Mr. Kennedy's efforts to express it with a just sobriety. Much of what the President will do in this connection, the peace movement will find incomprehensible and distasteful, and we intend to criticize watchfully (see the inside pages) but no longer in a tone of despair. In moving toward peace, Mr. Kennedy must carry with him somehow a party and a labor movement strongly attached to the arms race, and a country which would be startled if it too soon heard an entirely different tune on Soviet-American relations. In this, Mr. Kennedy's problem is much like Mr. Khrushchov's; both must conciliate rigid fanatics in their ranks; both must make co-existence appear as only another form of struggle to liberate the other's sphere of influence; neither can afford to appear "soft", the one on capitalism, the other on communism. But both are master politicians, and both are well aware of the crossroads to which history has brought them.

The immediate issue, the crucial main point, is the successful negotiation of a nuclear test ban treaty and its ratification by the Senate, which requires a two-thirds vote. This is a formidable hurdle. To achieve this arduous goal, the necessary first step toward wider settlement and relaxation of tension, all the contradictions and compromises plainly visible in the Kennedy program and official family—and there will be more of them—are justified. The President can be freed from these political necessities only by a more aroused and better informed public opinion. Never was there greater need for a broader peace movement than now; never was there a President more open to fresh ideas and more ready for flexible tactics. But the success of such a movement in affecting the course of events will depend on its unconventionality, its freedom from pacifist and party line stereotypes and a demonstrated independence of Moscow. What we need is not an organization to sell any particular panacea but to draw more and more people into discussing the problems of foreign policy and of peace. What we ourselves need most to lose are the chains of our old clichés.

Any President's power to act is limited by the people's power to understand. A whole series of unstable situations abroad may easily upset negotiations on critical wider issues. It would be good if public opinion understood that many of Mr. Kennedy's problems abroad are less the result of Soviet machinations than of the CIA's, the heritage of poor State Department policy and melodramatic thinking at home. It is silly to talk of Laos, the Congo and Cuba as tests of Soviet sincerity. Mr. Khrushchov cannot chase the Pathet Lao out of the jungle for us nor turn Mr. Lumumba into a willing tool of Belgian-American big business and he certainly cannot control Fidel Castro. If Dr. Castro were really a Communist, he could be turned on or off like a party line spigot, but he is a real revolutionary and a handful. In Cuba, more than anywhere else, there is need for private negotiation; the alternative is bloody intervention direct or covert, which would enflame the hemisphere; it is by our attitude toward Cuba not by new promises of new aid, *mañana,* that the Latin American masses will judge us. It is in this Lilliputian quarrel that I see the greatest danger.

A Different View of China's Famine

"In coldest objectivity and as a deterrent to muddled, wishful thinking in the West, three final vital points must be stressed in this survey of Mao Tse-tung's first real crisis in 12 years of power. The plight and prospects of China's hard-toiling 650 million people would be far worse in the recurrent famine crisis had the regime not ruthlessly promoted its uneven but dedicated programme of massive reconstruction and industrial expansion. . . . Wishful anticipation in America that the communes will be dissolved or emasculated is downright nonsense."

—"Mao Orders A Retreat to Farms to Fight Famine," London Sunday Times dispatch from Hongkong Jan. 29.

1960 Index Available Free to All Readers Including Newstand Buyers — Send Stamped Addressed Envelope

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

2/6/61

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED